

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Andrew Plummer,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No. 8:07-2741-TLW-BHH
	)	
George Goodwin, Officer Lieber	)	
Correctional Institution, et. al,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

The plaintiff, Andrew Plummer (“plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil action on August 10, 2007. (Doc. #1). The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Bruce Howe Hendricks pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(c), DSC.

On August 28, 2009, the plaintiff filed a motion for injunctive relief. (Doc. #43). The defendants filed a response in opposition to the plaintiff’s motion on September 3, 2009. (Doc. #47). On September 9, 2009 the plaintiff filed a motion to amend his motion for injunctive relief based on an error in the caption of the original motion. (Doc. #52). This motion to amend was granted by the Magistrate Judge on the same date. (Doc. #53).

This matter comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. #55). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the plaintiff’s motion for injunctive relief, (Doc. #43), be denied. (Doc. #55). The plaintiff filed no objections to the report. Objections were due on September 28, 2009.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #55). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief, (Doc. #43), is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

October 19, 2009  
Florence, South Carolina